

Tells the Facts and Names the Names CounterPunch

MAY 15-31, 1996

Ken Silverstein & Alexander Cockburn

VOL. 3, NO. 10

■ IN THIS ISSUE

Special Report on the Morris Dees Scam

- He Coaxes Dollars from Poor Folk, Sits on \$60 Million Hoard, Rarely Ventures into Court
- He Says He Fights Racism, Yet Former Aides Say His Center Is an Insult to the Civil Rights Movement, Trafficks in "Black Pain, White Guilt"
- He Wages an Unending Cover-Up to Silence Critics, While Angry Activists Shun His Center: "Don't Cross Dees"

Compete and Win in the Torture Trade

- Small Business Administration Promotes Export of Leg Irons

Plus:

- Pentagon and Homeless: Ready, Aim, Fire!
- Clinton's Election Strategy: Exit David Bonior, Enter Tommy Thompson



Good, Bad & Ugly

"I've got some good news for you. We're going to have a Republican president in 1996. The bad news is that it might be Bill Clinton."

— Alex Castellanos, GOP ad-man, to conservative leaders in Washington, May 14.

The Civil Rights Movement's TV Evangelist The Myth of Morris Dees

Morris Dees is the darling of the liberal jet set. Larry King calls him "one of America's great lawyers". George McGovern and Bill Moyers have lent their names to his fund-raising drives. From afar, northern admirers hail Dees's Montgomery, Alabama-based Southern Poverty Law Center, the richest civil rights organization in the nation. They hail its "Klan-watch" project and its strategy of bankrupting hate groups with civil judgments.

Amid all the publicity on the militia groups that followed the bombing of the Federal building in Oklahoma City in 1994, Dees offered himself in newspaper advertisements and well-publicized appearances before congressional committees as America's defiant expert on the threat posed by right-wing hate groups. These last few weeks he has been crisscrossing the country promoting his new book, *Gathering Storm: America's Militia Threat*, which went into bookstores on the April anniversary of the Oklahoma bombing.

But America's favorite Nazi hunter is a fraud, the Jim and Tammy Fay Bakker of the civil rights movement. Dees's Southern Poverty Law Center takes in more than \$40,000 a day in contributions, much of that from poor people, but dispenses few funds to protect civil rights or the poor. The Center employs few African-American attorneys and many of its black staffers over the years have quit in frustration. Gloria Browne, a lawyer who once worked with Dees's outfit, told *The Montgomery Advertiser* that the Center trafficks in "black pain and white guilt". Few people are aware of the criticisms leveled against Dees. He has systematically — and almost always successfully — sought to kill unflattering

portrayals of the Southern Poverty Law Center's operations.

Dees's first involvement with civil rights came in 1961, when the "Freedom Riders" rode buses into Montgomery to test segregation laws. They were met by a Ku Klux Klan sympathizer named Claude Henley, who led an attack on the Riders at a local bus station. Dees entered the fray — as Henley's attorney. Though he claims he was never personally supportive of Henley or the Klan, his former partner, Millard Fuller, has said, "We expressed openly our sympathies and support for what happened at the bus station".

While the civil rights movement raged across the South, Dees mostly sat on the sidelines. He grew rich from the marketing of Famous Recipe cookbooks, which he and Fuller developed. Fuller gave away much of his money and later started Habitat for Humanity, which builds homes for the poor. Dees built his tennis court, pool and stables, and bought a Rolls-Royce.

Dees set up the Center in 1971 and, during its early years, it achieved much. Center suits integrated the Alabama state troopers and got better conditions for victims of brown lung disease. Dees's outfit also represented a number of prisoners facing the death penalty.

But right from the start Dees was unenthusiastic about taking up causes that didn't generate big money. He joined forces with Millard Farmer (not to be confused with his earlier partner, Millard Fuller; Farmer is a brilliant death penalty lawyer and central figure in the book and movie *Dead Man Walking*) to found the Team Defense project, which represented poor clients on Death Row. About a year later, Dees pulled out, saying that

the project wasn't profitable and should be shut down.

A bitter feud with Farmer ensued, ultimately resolved when Dees agreed to pay \$50,000, the balance of fees due for clients of Team Defense. "If an issue isn't bringing in money, he's off to the woods", Farmer says. "He may believe in [civil rights] but he'll quit doing the work if it doesn't make money." Farmer describes the center as "little more than a 900 number".

One of Dees's biggest cases concerned a black woman named Beulah Mae Donald, whose teenage son had been lynched by two Klansmen. The pair had been tried and convicted in an Alabama court when Dees arrived on the scene, filing a civil suit against the United Klans of America on behalf of Beulah Mae. He won a \$7 million judgment, an achievement which Dees has trumpeted in fundraising solicitations ever since as having bankrupted the Klan.

In fact, the United Klans of America had total assets of one warehouse building on Lake Tuscaloosa. The sale of the building netted Mrs. Donald a mere

\$51,875, a figure not mentioned in fundraising materials. In 1986 and 1987 alone, the Southern Poverty Law Center raised some \$9 million from mailings that featured the case against the United Klans. Dees, who never met Mrs. Donald until shortly before the trial, used a death scene photo of her son in one solicitation that said money was urgently needed to pay the costs of the trial. The Center had a \$22 million endowment at the time. Cries of impending doom are standard in the Center's solicitations. In 1995, when the Center had more than \$60 million in reserves, Dees asked donors to cough up money for the "Militia Task Force", saying the "strain on our current operating budget is the greatest in our 25-year history".

Dees made \$60,000 as consultant to a movie which heavily featured the Donald story. The film — "The Line of Fire: The Morris Dees Story" — aired in 1991, with Dees and a white sidekick portrayed as the heroes. The true heroes of the story were Mrs. Donald's black lawyer, Michael Figures, and his brother, Assistant US Attorney Thomas Figures. They kept prosecution of the case alive and worked on it for years before Dees and the Center became involved. They were not mentioned in the movie.

Mrs. Donald stood to make \$130,000 from the production of *The Beulah Mae Donald Story*, whose main characters, in addition to its principal, were the Figures brothers. The Dees feature came out first and the Donald project was killed.

The Center's entire legal staff resigned in the late-1980s, in part because Dees was reluctant to take up the legal issues of most concern to poor people. His obsession was the Klanwatch Project, a cash cow which brought in millions. A Center lawyer once traveled to Mississippi to investigate the burning of a black family's home, suspected to be the work of the Klan. The family didn't think the Klan was involved. Instead, they complained of housing discrimination and other violations. The lawyer wanted the Center to pursue a housing discrimination suit, but Dees turned him down, saying that was a job for "some do-good lawyers".

The Klan is a despicable group but today it hardly represents a grave danger to the Republic (for poor blacks, the Contract With America is a far more immedi-

ate threat). Jesse Jackson has called the KKK as a "phantom of the past". Yet in the Center's fundraising solicitations — which modestly describe Dees as "the most dangerous man in America" — the Klan is portrayed as a group poised on the brink of power. One letter called the South a region where "armed Klan paramilitary forces freely roam our wooded hills" and participate in military maneuvers to "kill niggers and Jews in a race war they are planning".

In 1995, Dees filed a suit seeking to reverse the state of Alabama's reinstatement of the chain gang. The National Prison Project of the ACLU planned to file a suit on the matter, but Dees got wind of their plans and beat them to it.

Prison conditions in Alabama are indeed appalling but the Center has shown little interest in jailhouse matters during recent years. "Morris saw pictures of the chain gang and realized it was a gold mine", says Stephen Bright, head of Atlanta's Southern Center for Human Rights, a law professor at Yale and formerly a public defender in the District of Columbia. "Morris specializes in non-controversial cases. Everybody hates the Klan and the chain gangs. Nobody supports blowing up federal buildings with children inside. If there's press, Morris will be there. If people are suffering and

(continued on p. 4)

Editors
KEN SILVERSTEIN
ALEXANDER COCKBURN

Co-writer
BEN TERRALL

Production
TERRY ALLEN

Counselor
BEN SONNENBERG

Design
DEBORAH THOMAS

Published twice monthly except August, 22 issues a year:
\$40 individuals,
\$100 institutions,
\$25 student/low-income
CounterPunch.

All rights reserved.

CounterPunch welcomes all tips, information and suggestions. Please call or write our offices.

CounterPunch
P.O. Box 18675,
Washington, DC 20036
202-986-3665 (phone/fax)

He-e-e-re's Babylon

Washington Babylon, our new book intimately detailing the corruption of the political establishment, has just hit the bookstores. In bipartisan fashion, we savage Republicans and Democrats alike. We're offering *Washington Babylon* to CounterPunch subscribers for \$16.40 (includes postage), a discount of 20 percent.

Our St. Louis readers can hear Ken Silverstein talk about the book at Left Bank Books on Thursday, June 20 at 7:30 p.m. Alexander Cockburn will speak in Los Angeles on June 10. Consult local listings.

SBA Staffs Torture Trade

Amid the busy press of events in Babylon, the national media had no time for the "Tactical Skills and Countermeasures Conference", held at the DC Sheraton in late April. The trade show, featuring torture devices and kindred instruments, was sponsored by the British-based Contingency and Operational Procurement Exhibitions, known familiarly as COPEX.

As the company pr explains, "COPEX is a private (i.e. non-public) trade exhibition organized for three specific, international end user groups: tri-service special operations forces...specialist law enforcement operations...[and] intelligence agencies." Among those buying hardware through COPEX have been end users such as Saudi Arabia, Turkey, China and Indonesia.

As busy shoppers prowled the exhibition floor, officials from the US Small Business Administration were on hand to "aid, counsel, assist and protect the interests of small business concerns". Duly bolstered by the helping federal hand were such outfits as the US affiliate of the British firm of Hiatt Thompson.

For more than two hundred years craftsmen at this venerable concern have been making sturdy Hiatt Thompson "Belly Chains" and "Leg Cuffs", deploying skills first honed in the glory days of the slave trade. Public outcry following a British TV documentary, "The Torture Trail", forced Parliament to ban the manufacture and export of such equipment. So sales are now handled here by Hiatt Thompson Corp.

Admission to the COPEX show was restricted to those with military-industrial or government ID. Press passes were hard to come by but several protesters managed to slip in. Art Laffin, a member of Ploughshares, says "there were over 100 exhibits and several hundred people inside. We saw a sign advertising King Hussein of Jordan as the main guest that evening. Along with surveillance equipment, we saw stun guns, laser guns, high tech rifles, telescopic lenses and lots of military apparel."

After thorough inspection, Laffin and a comrade addressed the crowd, telling them it was time to convert from a military to a peace economy and unfurling a

banner that read COPEX=DEATH. From among the crowd came the angry cry, "The reason you can do what you're doing is because of law enforcement." Security guards swiftly hauled the two protesters away.

The life of a torture salesman is not without inconvenience. In Germany last year a COPEX bazaar was canceled after protesters publicized the neo-Nazi ties of its local organizer. In England COPEX sued the group Campaign Against the Arms Trade for alleging that COPEX brokered sales of "electroshock batons and other torture equipment". COPEX

Among the companies at the trade show was Hiatt Thompson, maker of "Belly Chains" and "Leg Cuffs".

director Julian Winkley insists that "electroshock batons have never been at the show", though he adds that "if a company were in possession of them legally and wished to exhibit them, then we would have no problem with that".

Indeed, COPEX's British catalog states helpfully that "just because the product you might desire may not be listed does not mean that it cannot be supplied". In early 1995 a British journalist proved the truth of this claim by

posing as a buyer for Zaire and successfully arranging to purchase electroshock batons from an entrepreneur working a COPEX booth. Such implements were banned in England in 1988. Last year an Angolan refugee who had been repeatedly subjected to electroshock torture in Zaire said, "you can't imagine the pain these batons inflict."

Winkley bluffly dismisses the British electroshock baton scandal as akin to "what goes on in a bar," adding "you can't close the bar down because two people get together to make a deal." When asked if such devices were for sale in Washington, Winkley answered "not to my knowledge". He overlooked Inbrafil, a Brazilian company which peddled their "electric sticks...specially developed for riot control" to the enthusiastic procurers in the bowels of the DC Sheraton.

Should such purveyors of weaponry as Benchmade Knife Company ("the leading American manufacturer of one hand opening tactical knives") and FN Manufacturing, Inc. ("a quality supplier of Military Small Arms...our in-house Engineering staff will design products to meet your specific requirements") receive financial aid from the Federal Government?

The Small Business Administration's press liaison explains that the agency was at COPEX DC to provide "access to information on acquiring financial, business development, import/export, and procurement assistance from the federal government".

Coming soon, to a trade show near you: SBA assistance for the crack trade. ■

Pentagon Declares War on the Homeless

President Clinton and Congress continue to throw money at the Pentagon with great enthusiasm. The C-17 transport plane, the B-2 bomber and other Cold War-era boondoggles still eat up billions of dollars in taxpayer money. But the generals at Pork Central are angry over what they see as insufficient funding for "modernization programs" — i.e., gold-plated weaponry that prop up their friends in the arms industry — and have taken out their wrath on the homeless.

The Defense Authorization Bill now before Congress contains \$3.5 million for the Pentagon to "provide assistance to homeless shelters so long as the assistance does not interfere with military preparedness or military requirements". Pentagon officials have asked that the money be struck from the bill, this being possibly the first time in history the Pentagon has actually recommended a cut in its own budget. "Modernization programs, such as the Armored Gun System, have been canceled because of a lack of funds", a group of military officials wrote to Congress. "Therefore, the committee believes that providing \$3.5 million to this program qualifies as interference with military preparedness and military requirements." ■

(Dees, continued from p. 2)

the cameras aren't there, you'll never convince the Southern Poverty Law Center to go in."

Dees entirely controls the Southern Poverty Law Center's operations. His friends and colleagues dominate its board. He and other top executives receive salaries in excess of \$100,000 a year.

The Center is loath to allow outsiders to examine its books but its filings to the IRS, required for all non-profits, are quite revealing. During the past decade, the Center's expenditures on its projects have never matched the interest earnings on its huge endowment, which now stands at \$68 million. In 1992-1993, the Center raised \$11.4 million in contributions and had total revenues of \$13.6 million. Its program expenditures were \$4.2 million. In 1994, while income rose to \$15.2 million, spending was \$4.9 million.

Much of the money is provided by poor and elderly people on fixed incomes, responding to the Center's dramatic appeals for money. *The Montgomery Advertiser* is the only major newspaper to have taken a hard look at the Center's finances, publishing an eight-part series on the organization in 1994. It uncovered one case where a woman sent a check along with a note explaining that she needed to buy an overcoat but preferred to send her money to the embattled Center. Dees passed the note around the office and then incorporated the woman's letter in a new fundraising appeal.

The American Institute of Philanthropy grades charities on their spending of contributions and gives organizations an F if they can operate for more than five years without raising more money. In 1993, when the Center had \$52 million in reserves, \$16 million less than today, the AIP calculated that it could operate for 6.7 years without another penny. Only three of 300 charities examined by the AIP could have funded their programs for longer. The Council on Foreign Relations, spartan in contrast, had reserves to cover 3.8 years of operations.

Defending his group's huge reserves, Dees says that the Center is seeking to build a \$100 million endowment, at which point it will be able to end fundraising forever and concentrate on its civil rights work. Dees has been pitching this line at least since 1978, when the

Center's newsletter said it would halt fundraising activities as soon as it had accumulated \$55 million. When Bill Moyers learned of the Center's hoarding of cash a few years ago, he stopped acting as a fundraiser for Dees.

What's especially vile is that the Center rarely ventures into court. Between October of 1989 and December of 1994, the Center filed only a dozen suits; just two of these went to trial. During one 14 month stretch the Southern Poverty Law Center filed not a single lawsuit. During the five year period, the Center took in about \$50 million in contributions, more than \$4 million per lawsuit.

In 1995 the Center spent less than \$2 million on its legal cases. When a journalist asked for details of litigation, Dees came up with only three complaints: a suit on behalf of Connie Mansfield, whose son was murdered by the head of a white supremacist group and who was eventually awarded \$1 million by a Florida court; a suit seeking to prevent William Pierce, author of the racist novel *The Turner Diaries*, from collecting royalties; and a suit seeking damages for the heirs of Dr. David Gunn, who was murdered in 1993 by an anti-abortion activist. Stephen Bright runs a true civil rights organization and one that's not afraid to take on unpopular causes. His Southern Center for Human Rights has an annual budget of \$600,000, currently handling 50 death penalty cases and 24 cases on prison conditions. One person who formerly worked for Dees's outfit says, "The Southern Poverty Law Center doesn't raise money to do the work. It raises money to raise more money."

Dees declined our request for an interview, but the Center's Judy Bruno tells us that the number of cases handled by the Center is irrelevant and that it's the impact the cases have that counts. She also said that the Center performs far more than purely legal transactions. She points to its educational projects, such as the "Teaching Tolerance" program which provides free educational materials to schools across the country.

Dees's own lawyering skills are unimpressive. His big victory in the Donald suit was due to the hard work of the Figures brothers in the criminal case. Dees was especially inept in the 1975 defense of Joan Little, who was acquitted

Wall Street Journal Ends Hunt for Red Clinton

As noted in our February 1 issue, *The Wall Street Journal* had been predicting earlier this year that Bill Clinton's re-election strategy would have the president moving sharply left. Last January 23, the morning of the State of the Union address, a *Journal* editorial said that Clinton's most important and powerful allies within the Democratic Party were the "ideological liberals", whose chieftain the *Journal* identified as Michigan Rep. David Bonior.

After waiting patiently for months for Clinton to submit to Bonior's fierce will, the *Journal* has finally given up and faced the facts. Paul Gigot, "Potomac Watch" columnist for the *Journal* editorial page, wrote on May 24:

"I've recently tried to keep a list of conservative ideas Mr. Clinton has embraced. I don't dare miss a speech or press conference. Repeal the gas tax? Of, course. Megan's Law to inform neighborhoods about convicted sex offenders? Let's hold a White House signing ceremony. A tax credit for adoption? Splendid idea. Deplore judges who are soft on crime? His own appointee, Judge Harold Baer, is a bum! Drug war? Call in Gen. Barry McCaffrey for reinforcements...

"Lately, Mr. Clinton has been moving so fast to the right he's beating Mr. Dole to the spot. He declared his opposition to same sex marriages even before the Kansan could make it an issue. Then, lest Mr. Dole find even an inch of running room, the president preemptively endorsed a GOP bill to allow other states to ignore the constitution's Full Faith and Credit clause and reject Hawaii's looming endorsement of gay marriage. Who needs the Christian Coalition when Bill Clinton is around."

Gigot somehow forgot to mention Clinton's endorsement of the most vicious welfare program in the country, from Wisconsin Governor Tommy Thompson. There's only one issue Bob Dole has left, the "Star Wars" missile defense. We confidently expect Clinton to hold an unveiling ceremony soon, perhaps on July 4. ■

of murdering her jailer (who tried to rape her). Dees was dismissed from the case early on when Judge Hamilton Hobgood charged him with coaching a witness. Charges were later dropped; Dees claimed he had merely been trying to get the person to repeat previous testimony.

Yet Dees's dismissal didn't stop the Center from milking the Little case for money. A decade later Center mailings talked of the organization's brave attorneys who "successfully defended JoAnn [sic] Little".

For a civil rights crusader, Dees has taken a number of bizarre stands. When Fred Gray — the first black lawyer in Montgomery and a man whose clients included Rosa Parks and Martin Luther King — was nominated for a federal judgeship, Dees withheld his support. Meanwhile, he backed the appointment of Brad Reynolds as the Reagan administration's chief civil rights enforcer and in 1992 supported George Bush's nomination of Edward Carnes to the federal bench. When civil rights groups complained about his endorsement of Carnes, Dees said, "What they think has no effect on my life one way or another."

A *New York Times* puff piece on Dees, published last May 12, noted the Carnes controversy, describing the judge as a "death penalty advocate". This, Bright says, is like describing John Wilkes Booth as a "Southern sympathizer". Carnes — who replaced Judge Frank Johnson, a courageous Republican who reformed Alabama's prisons and mental health system — has devoted most of his career to promoting executions and removing legal obstacles to state killing. He wrote the death penalty law in Alabama, which is one of the most one-sided in the nation. For example, even if a jury votes for life imprisonment, the judge can override and impose a death sentence. One-quarter of the prisoners on death row in Alabama are override cases.

Carnes argues that the death penalty is not racist. While he was assistant attorney general in Alabama and the state's point man on the death penalty, ten men were executed, of whom eight were African-American. Carnes defended one prosecutor who divided potential jurors into four categories: strong, medium, weak and black. He has also said that defendants in Alabama have excellent

lawyers, despite numerous cases where public defenders barely put up a defense. Death penalty opponents found examples of defense attorneys being drunk during trial and one case where a lawyer representing a death row prisoner filed a one-page brief to the Supreme Court. According to Bright, "Killing poor people in Alabama is like shooting ducks in a barrel because the lawyering is so bad."

Carnes, incidentally, was easily confirmed. The only Democratic senator who bothered to show up at the hearing was Alabama's Howell Heflin, one of Carnes's chief backers. Senators Ted

The Center's entire legal staff resigned in the late-1980s, partly because Dees was so reluctant to take up legal issues of most concern to the poor.

Kennedy, Joe Biden and Paul Simon had more important matters to attend to that day. More recently Carnes met with Senators Strom Thurmond and Orrin Hatch, and helped draw up a section of the Clinton administration's anti-terrorism bill, which severely limits the ability of federal courts to review state convictions.

Most top jobs at the Dees Center have been filled by whites. Between 1971 and 1994, the Center hired only two black attorneys, both of whom quit in frustration. The fundraising staff, however, has been largely female, black and low-paid. One factor in the late-1980s exodus was that the Center refused to provide benefits to its low-wage employees.

For its 1994 series, *The Montgomery Advertiser* interviewed thirteen former black staffers, twelve of whom complained of racial problems at the Center. Christine Lee interned at the Center in the late-1980s while studying at the Harvard Law School. Like many black employees, she found a paternalistic posture on the part of the Center's top directors, including Dees and legal director Richard Cohen. Lee remembers Cohen calling his black secretary "a credit to her race" and says his nickname for her was "Little Girl". Lee, who now practices law in Washington, tells us that Co-

hen "thought it was a term of endearment but I doubt he'd use it for someone that wasn't black and female."

When Lee returned to Harvard she wrote an evaluation of her experience, saying, "I found the attorneys racist, sexist, and condescending...They take license to make racist jokes and rationalize it because their work is devoted to championing 'our' cause." Based on the experiences of Lee and of Dennis Sweet, a lawyer in Mississippi whom colleagues describe as one of the most brilliant attorneys ever to practice in the DC public defender's office, Harvard Law School professor Charles Ogletree no longer recommends that African Americans work at the Southern Poverty Law Center. "I cannot encourage people to go there," he told *CounterPunch*. Alabama civil rights lawyer Rose Sanders has called the Center's employment practices "a mockery of those who died to end discrimination".

Over the years a number of media outlets, including "60 Minutes", have begun investigations into Dees's affairs, but most have backed off after receiving complaints from Dees and his supporters. Former staffers who have spoken to the press have been subjected to smear jobs. When Christine Lee spoke

SUBSCRIPTION INFO

Enter/renew subscription here:

- ☐ One year individual, \$40
- ☐ One year institution, \$100
- ☐ One year student/low-income, \$25
- ☐ Please send back issue(s) _____ (\$3/issue)
- ☐ I am enclosing a separate sheet for gift subscriptions

Name _____

Address _____

City/State/Zip _____

Payment must accompany order.
Add \$10 for foreign subscriptions.
Make checks payable to: **CounterPunch**.
Return to: **CounterPunch**.
P.O. Box 18675
Washington, DC 20036

to a *Montgomery Advertiser* reporter, a crony of Dees's accused her of being hostile to white people. Lee's mother is white, as is her husband.

When the *Advertiser* submitted its 1994 series on the Center for a Pulitzer Prize, Dees worked relentlessly to sabotage the entry, whistling up supportive letters from Joan Claybrook of Public Citizen, Rabbi Abraham Cooper of the Simon Wiesenthal Center and George McGovern.

In the 1960s, Dees had sued the *Advertiser* over its segregated wedding announcements and now George McGovern sent a letter to Seymour Toppling, administrator of the prize, saying that Dees was the victim of "revenge". "[It would] be ironic", McGovern wrote, "if the Pulitzer Committee played an inadvertent role in smearing one of the great champions of justice and tolerance." (*The New York Times* also served up this charge in its May story, saying that Dees dates the *Advertiser*'s hostility to him to "his lawsuit...forcing the paper to desegregate its wedding page".)

The true story is entirely different. The *Advertiser* had been a viciously racist newspaper but began a new life after being sold in the early-1960s. The newspaper was already planning to abandon the practice of segregated wedding announcements when Dees, apparently having learned of the impending change, filed a half-baked lawsuit that was later summarily dismissed by Judge Frank Johnson. That decision was upheld when Dees appealed. Dees's attention-grab-

bing suit actually delayed changes at the newspaper because the owners didn't want to be seen as caving in to outside pressure. Ray Jenkins, a senior editor at the time, calls Dees's version of the affair "an out and out lie".

Jim Tharp, who edited the *Advertiser*'s groundbreaking series on the Center, says that the newspaper had been generally friendly to Dees and the Center. The *Advertiser* had published a series called "A Mighty Stream" to celebrate the Center's unveiling of its Civil Rights Memo-

The Center raised \$50 million from donors during a five-year stretch in which it filed only a dozen suits.

rial. Tharp himself had attended several Christmas parties at the Center, which is separated from the newspaper by a parking lot, and Dees was a volunteer for an *Advertiser* charity. As Tharp points out, Dan Morse, the lead reporter on the later series, was a five-year-old living in Illinois when Dees filed his case. "We started asking questions because we kept hearing stories from former employees [about racism and shady fundraising] at the Center," Tharp says.

A number of former staffers at Dees's Center wrote to the Pulitzer Committee to defend the *Advertiser*. "As a black attorney and a former intern...I am quite aware of the extraordinary public rela-

tions machinery that the Center can bring to bear upon its foes", wrote Montgomery lawyer Donald Jackson. "Without doubt, the Center's hiring practices as it relates to minorities and minority attorneys, in particular, are atrocious. For critics to claim that the *Advertiser*'s reporting on these and other issues was somehow in retaliation for SPLC's having filed a lawsuit in the 1960s...borders on being bizarre."

McGovern later wrote a letter of apology to the *Advertiser*. "I should not have criticized your paper without a careful independent investigation", he confessed. "I regret it all the more after learning that you are one of the precious few in the small band of editors who supported me in '72."

Every time anyone criticizes the Center, Dees and his entourage claim that they are being smeared by unscrupulous adversaries. Judy Bruno told **CounterPunch** that the organization's critics "always have an axe to grind with us. It's called jealousy. They have organizations that aren't as successful as ours."

So it seems that everybody is out to get poor Morris Dees. Stephen Bright, Millard Farmer, *The Montgomery Advertiser*, the former staffers who have complained about conditions at the Center: all nurse petty grudges, which account for their criticism. It's reminiscent of the man on vacation who complains, "You people don't drive very well around here. This is the third accident I've been in today." ■

CounterPunch
P.O. Box 18675
Washington, DC 20036

Note to Subscribers

A number of subscribers have been confused about the expiration date on their subs. Please note your expiration date on the mailing label. The first number refers to issue number and the second to year. Hence, 10/97 means your sub ends with the 10th issue of 1997 (the May 16-31 issue). Just look at our masthead to see which numbered issue you are reading. So please remember: the first number — 10 in the above example — DOES NOT refer to the month your sub expires.